



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/642,615 | 08/19/2003 | Ali Afzali-Ardakani | YOR920030023US1 | 3761 |
| 48150 | 7590 | 03/03/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC | | | GAKH, YELENA G | |
| 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| SUITE 200 | | | 1797 | |
| VIENNA, VA 22182-3817 | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/03/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| 10/642,615 | AFZALI-ARDAKANI ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D. | 1797 | |

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED **19 February 2008** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Yelena G. Gakh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the examiner disagrees with the Applicants' remarks that the amendment does not raise new issues. Claim 14, contrary to the Applicants' remarks, does not recite the limitation of the newly amended claim 1, in particular, "a central fragment of said light-sensitive compound between said two arms, which comprises a moiety ...". The language of claim 14 did not contain recitation of the central fragment.

Continuation of 13. Other: in response to the Applicants' remarks that the rejection of the pending claims under 112, first paragraph, was withdrawn by the Notice of Panel Decision, the examiner would like to express once more, that withdrawing rejections established in the previous Office action is a formal act for re-opening the prosecution of the case. It has nothing to do with the panel's decision to withdraw rejection because the rejection did not have the grounds. In the instant case the panel decided to re-open the prosecution of the application, because it has been established that besides rejections under 112, first paragraph, it would be possible to establish rejections over the prior art, which was done in the following Office action. The examiner established rejections under 112, first paragraph, properly using all criteria for this type of rejections, and the panel did not find anything wrong with the rejections. The statement that "the application remains under appeal because there is at least one actual issue for appeal" is used when the rejection remains unchanged. The panel established that there were at least two issues, which required re-opening of the application. The examiner is a member of the panel and is responsible for what she is putting in writing. The examiner respectfully requests the Applicants to provide a paragraph from MPEP, which requires the panel to meet again for repeating decision that was clearly indicated in its first meeting: the rejections are withdrawn and the prosecution is re-opened. Again, the examiner would like to repeat the rule, according to which re-opening the case automatically results in withdrawing the previous rejection. It does not mean that the rejection cannot be re-established with the new rejection added. The Appellants respectfully requests to properly respond to the rejections established by the examiner.